

1988

## Settlement Patterns in Alachua County, Florida, 1850-1860

Everett W. Claudle



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Florida Historical Quarterly by an authorized editor of STARS. For more information, please contact [STARS@ucf.edu](mailto:STARS@ucf.edu).

---

### Recommended Citation

Claudle, Everett W. (1988) "Settlement Patterns in Alachua County, Florida, 1850-1860," *Florida Historical Quarterly*: Vol. 67 : No. 4 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq/vol67/iss4/4>

## SETTLEMENT PATTERNS IN ALACHUA COUNTY, FLORIDA, 1850-1860

by EVERETT W. CAUDLE

**I**N 1773, the English botanist William Bartram traveled through north-central Florida. Impressed with the richness of the soil in the Alachua region, he commented on the variety and quantity of crops that the Indians who lived there seemed to grow with ease.<sup>1</sup> Despite Bartram's favorable report, and later comments like it, few settlers arrived in the area to establish farms and plantations when Florida became an American territory in 1821. Indeed, more than just fertile soil would be needed to lure farmers into the Florida wilderness. In this regard, the account of plantation agriculture's arrival in Alachua County, Florida, will help illustrate the forces that shaped later migrations onto the southern frontier. For though there were many reasons for resettlement, the elements that impelled people to move from one place to another can be reduced to two basic forces: one pushing and the other pulling. While the prospect of increased prosperity is often recognized as a powerful force that "pulled" people toward the wilderness, the "push" of unfavorable conditions that sometimes existed in the more settled regions of the antebellum South was also a significant impetus to migration.

The settlement of the frontier throughout the South was characterized by two waves of emigration. The first consisted of herdsmen who subsisted primarily by grazing their livestock on the open domain— the majority of which was public. The forests

---

Everett W. Caudle is a graduate student in history, University of Florida. the author wishes to express his appreciation to Patricia Smith Garretson for allowing him to use her census data. A version of this paper, read at the Phi Alpha Theta state meeting, April 15, 1989, at the University of Central Florida, received the award for best graduate paper.

1. Mark Van Doren, ed., *The Travels of William Bartram* (New York, 1928), 169-70.

abounded with acorns, roots, and vegetation which would easily support large numbers of swine, and the savannas and open woodlands were covered with wild oats, grasses, vetch, and pea vines that provided pasturage for cattle.<sup>2</sup> Hogs and cows could freely roam the open territory fattening themselves during the spring and summer. In the winter, the beasts were herded together and driven to markets to be sold. Early settlement patterns in Florida were hardly any different. Around 1850, one observer described the situation as it had been a few years earlier. "So numerous were the herds of cattle in Alachua before the war [the Second Seminole War, 1835-1842] that from 7,000 to 10,000 could be seen grazing at once on Payne's prairie; and there was a single grazier on the Wacasassa [west of present-day Gainesville] whose stock had increased in the course of a few years to the number of 3,000 without any other expense than that of *herding* them."<sup>3</sup>

Livestock herding was only profitable when large amounts of land remained available for free grazing. With the arrival of the second wave of settlers—farmers and planters—the livestock drovers either left the area for the new frontier or themselves became tillers of the soil. Solon Robinson, a traveling journalist for the *American Agriculturist*, commented during the late 1840s that in the recently settled region of west Florida, farmers no longer "make pork for the people." Robinson further noted that "cattle and sheep are plenty, and just as mean as could be desired." But he added, "they are worthless to a cotton planter, causing him to build a great deal of fence and affording him no profit."<sup>4</sup> Livestock herders were thus simultaneously pushed from the forests and savannas and pulled towards the more unsettled frontier. However, the conditions that impelled the farmer or planter to move into the wilderness were more complex. There was the lure of fertile but inexpensive (and sometimes even free) land that beckoned to those hearty enough to

- 
2. Frank L. Owsley, "The Pattern of Migration and Settlement on the Southern Frontier," *Journal of Southern History* 11 (May 1945), 149-50; Lewis C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, 2 vols. (New York, 1941), II, 831-33.
  3. "Florida: Its Soil and Products," *The Western Journal* 6 (June 1851), 181.
  4. Herbert A. Kellar, ed., *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist*, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, 1936), II, 461.

try their luck. Yet the attraction of the frontier alone would not have been sufficient to pull a Georgia or South Carolina agriculturist from the familiar surroundings of a farm or plantation that he had spent time and labor clearing, planting, and— it would seem— improving.

In 1851, a farmer from Troup County, Georgia, lamented about the agricultural condition of his region. “We are awfully bad off up here, having worn out one of the prettiest and most pleasant countries in the world. . . . It is true, we have many of the marks of age, and if a young Rip Van Winkle should find himself suddenly waked up in the middle of some of our large plantations, when he looked out upon the waving broomsedge, the barren hill sides, and the terribly big gullies, it would not be wonderful if he should not feel that he was *about home*.”<sup>5</sup> This farmer was describing a situation that had been witnessed earlier in older regions of the plantation South. The frontier method of cultivation, which required a constant supply of virgin land in order to produce consistently high yields of exportable crops such as tobacco and cotton, had ruined the region for any further profitable agricultural production.

Farming practices in the antebellum South were still influenced by frontier conditions, for agriculture as a science was little known. Solon Robinson, traveling through Georgia in the vicinity of Macon, commented on the exhausted condition of the region. “Much of the soil of the surrounding country has been wickedly destroyed by a system of cultivation prevalent all over the south.” He described the practice of “plowing very shallow, up and down hill, which has had the effect to send the surface all down to the rivers.” Robinson believed that “probably no soil in the world has ever produced more wealth in so short a time, nor been more rapidly wasted of its native fertility, than the central part of this state.”<sup>6</sup>

Intensive agricultural cultivation became widespread in the early nineteenth century just about the time large bodies of Indian lands began to be available as a result of wars and treaties. First in middle Georgia, and then later in southwestern Georgia and southern Alabama, vast areas were opened for settlement.

---

5. Letter to the editor (Columbus, GA) *Soil of the South* 1 (July 1845), 36.

6. Kellar, *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist*, II, 459.

These lands proved to be very suitable for the cultivation of Green-Seed or Upland Cotton, a product that had only become profitable with the invention of the cotton gin in 1793. Large numbers of planters and farmers from Virginia and the Carolinas moved onto these lands, and by 1830, a wide belt of cotton plantations stretched from South Carolina through middle Georgia, across southwestern Georgia and southern Alabama, and westward to the Mississippi River.<sup>7</sup> In the late 1830s, however, many planters who had been part of the move were facing problems of soil exhaustion and declining crop yields. For these people, there were two options: they could supplement their land with expensive and tedious methods of fertilization, or they could emigrate once again to areas where virgin acreage was available for cultivation.

Most farmers probably preferred not to leave their homes and resettle on the frontier. Families who had established strong ties to their communities were understandably reluctant to emigrate. One Georgia farmer described his objections to migration. "I have, in the first place, a family of children to educate, and my neighborhood affords excellent school facilities. . . . In the next place, I have a home which I love, I have built me a good comfortable house, my negro houses, barn and stables are all good, I have fine orchards, my wife has beautified our yard with flowers and shrubs, we have an excellent set of neighbors, and I really feel that it would be severing some of the dearest ties of life to have to leave this spot, so endeared by association."<sup>8</sup> Examining land values in Hancock County, Georgia, James Bonner found that during the 1850s the most productive acreage was owned by a few wealthy planters. These individuals also possessed much of the unimproved property in the area. For the plantation elite, the purchase of extra land thus served as insurance against resettlement because unimproved acreage could be brought into cultivation when older land was worn-out and became unproductive.<sup>9</sup>

---

7. James C. Bonner, *A History of Georgia Agriculture, 1732-1860* (Athens, 1964), 41-42. See also chapter 4 for a description of the rise of Upland or "Green-Seed" Cotton.

8. Letter to the editor (Columbus, GA) *Soil of the South* 1 (March 1851), 53.

9. James C. Bonner, "Profile of a Late Ante-Bellum Community," *American Historical Review* 59 (July 1944), 675; Bonner, *History of Georgia Agriculture*, 67.

By the mid-1840s the agricultural situation in the older southern states was growing more serious. The disastrous results of cheap land and ruinous cultivation techniques were evident throughout the Georgia and South Carolina plantation belt. To make matters more difficult, southwest Georgia, Alabama, and the Florida panhandle were no longer considered agricultural frontiers.<sup>10</sup> If a farmer were to find fresh acreage, he would have to look far afield to the distant West— perhaps as far away as Texas— or south into the heart of north-central Florida.

That the unsettled area of Florida would offer a viable source of fresh, fertile land, in retrospect, seems obvious. After all, Florida was closer than Louisiana, Arkansas, or Texas. Furthermore, the climate and topographical features of north-central Florida were similar to many areas of Georgia and South Carolina. With the available lands in Alabama and Mississippi already under cultivation by the late 1830s Florida should have been an almost sure alternative to many settlers. But conditions in much of the Florida territory at that time were not peaceful enough to attract a large number of people into the region. Furthermore, conditions in the older states had not yet reached the critical point they would in the next few years.

North-central Florida in the 1830s was still a vast wilderness. In 1824, three years after Florida became a territory, the Territorial Council created Alachua County. Newnansville, about eighteen miles northwest of present-day Gainesville, became the county seat, and a federal land office was opened there. Nevertheless, settlement was very slow, the major obstacle being a problem with the Seminole Indians. In 1829, upon assuming the office of president, Andrew Jackson began a policy of removing the Seminoles from Florida to reservations in the West. He met a strong resistance from the Indians, and in 1835, open warfare broke out between the government and the group of Seminoles whose leaders vowed to remain in Florida. By July 1836, every settlement south of Newnansville had been destroyed. Settlers were forced into the scattered fortified areas,

---

10. Bonner, *History of Georgia Agriculture*, 63; J. D. B. De Bow, *Industrial Resources, Etc. of the Southern and Western States*, 3 vols. (New Orleans, 1852), I, 355.

and in many cases they had to be supplied with government rations. The war continued for seven years.<sup>11</sup>

Early settlement in north-central Florida was also stifled by a dearth of transportation routes in and out of the region. In 1822, settlers in Micanopy had built a road east to Picolata which was located on the St. Johns River a few miles from St. Augustine. Also in use was a "cart road" that led from Micanopy, through the eastern half of Alachua County, and then northwest to the south Georgia port of St. Marys.<sup>12</sup> But the major route of transportation through Alachua County was the Bellamy Road. Completed in 1826 and funded by allocations from the United States Congress, the Bellamy Road traveled west from St. Augustine through the northern part of Alachua County to Pensacola. The road was twenty-five feet wide and was the major east-west highway used by Florida planters to haul their agricultural products to market.<sup>13</sup>

The Second Seminole War and its logistical problems did much to improve transportation into north-central Florida. Military roads were built from the St. Johns River into the interior, and by 1835, regular steamboat service was established between several landings on the upper and lower St. Johns River and Savannah, Georgia. On October 8, 1835, the Jacksonville Courier reported that the "steamer FLORIDA arrived at our wharves last evening from Savannah on her way to Picolata. We are glad to see her gliding up and down our river. It seems to give life to everything."<sup>14</sup> In the 1840s, several other steamers established regular service between ports on the St. Johns River and Savan-

- 
11. Charles H. Hildreth and Merlin G. Cox, *History of Gainesville, Florida, 1854-1879* (Gainesville, 1981), 4-5; F. W. Buchholz, *History of Alachua County, Florida: Narrative and Biographical* (St Augustine, 1929), 90.
  12. Buchholz, *History of Alachua County*, 58. For a discussion of the "cart road" from Micanopy to St. Marys, see Burke G. Vanderhill, "The Alachua-St. Marys Road," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 66 (July 1987), 50-67.
  13. Appropriations for the Bellamy Road were authorized by Congress in 1824. The major part of the funding, \$20,000, was to be used for the main roadway, while \$3,000 was to be used for construction of branch roads. The road's surface was hard sand and clay, and the government stipulated that no stumps were to be left standing higher than twelve inches. Julia Floyd Smith, *Slavery and Plantation Growth in Antebellum Florida, 1821-1860* (Gainesville, 1973), 21-22; Buchholz, *History of Alachua County*, 58.
  14. Jacksonville Courier, October 8, 1835.

nah, and it became much easier to ship Florida agricultural products to northern and southern ports.<sup>15</sup>

The cessation of the Indian war and improved transportation facilities combined in the early 1840s to make north-central Florida a more attractive place to settle. There were, nonetheless, a small number of Seminoles who continued to make occasional raids. The Indians' presence and the desire to open the frontier caused Congress to pass the Armed Occupation Act in 1842 opening 200,000 acres south of present-day Alachua for settlement. The Act provided 160 acres of land to any single man over eighteen or the head of a family who could bear arms and would live on the parcel for five consecutive years and cultivate at least five acres.<sup>16</sup>

Although many of the new settlers moved through north-central Florida to make their selections further south in the present-day Orange and Polk counties area, others took advantage of the rich soils and mild climate of the Alachua region. A few of the settlers had been in the area earlier and were asserting claims to land that they had previously staked out. However, it was estimated in June 1843, that well over one-half of the people filing claims were from outside Florida— most from Georgia and South Carolina.<sup>17</sup>

Plantation agriculture slowly gained a foothold throughout north-central Florida. The region's attractiveness was enhanced when it was discovered that Sea-Island Cotton— a fine, high quality, long staple cotton that commanded a premium price on the market— would thrive in the interior of the state. Because the peninsula was affected by the both the Gulf and Atlantic sea breezes, this long staple variety of cotton was not restricted to the coastal regions as it had been in other southern states. One

---

15. For a discussion of early steamboat service in Florida, see Edward A. Mueller, "East Coast Florida Steamboating, 1831-1861," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 40 (January 1962), 241-56.

16. There were other conditions that limited each man's selection. Sites could not be located on any coastal island or within two miles of any established fort. Also excluded were private claims already established. The land south of the Peace River was declared an Indian reservation and was, therefore, also out of bounds. A 200,000-acre limit was placed upon total selections. See James W. Covington, "The Armed Occupation Act of 1842," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 40 (July 1961), 41-52.

17. St. Augustine *Florida Herald*, June 5, 1843, quoted in Covington, "The Armed Occupation Act of 1842," 46.

writer, extolling north Florida's agricultural virtues, noted that "a superior quality of this article had been produced extensively on the Suwannee, and in the very centre of Alachua, as well as on the eastern coast."<sup>18</sup> By January 22, 1847, the *Jacksonville News* noted the exports that were leaving Florida's interior for outside markets. The editor wrote: "The Steamer St. Matthews, on Tuesday last, left this place freighted with one hundred and twenty three bales of sea island cotton. . . . This is a most auspicious evidence of the improved cultivation of our new State, for it is by far the most valuable cargo that has ever been shipped in one week from the St. Johns."<sup>19</sup>

North-central Florida's appeal as an agriculture bonanza grew throughout the latter half of the 1840s and into the 1850s. Farmers and planters in the worn-out regions of the older southern states quickly discovered that affordable and inhabitable acreage was available only a few hundred miles away. Even those who had missed the opportunity for free land under the Armed Occupation Act found that acreage remained relatively cheap. As late as 1851 Solon Robinson claimed that in Florida "the advantages offered to any farmer desirous of locating a cotton plantation are probably greater than in any other state east of the Mississippi. Improved lands can be bought from \$5 to \$10 an acre— less than the present value of a single crop."<sup>20</sup>

An examination of the 1850 Florida census returns will reveal that the combination of forces— the "push" from the older, exhausted regions and the "pull" of opportunity in the new Florida frontier— had a marked effect upon the population.<sup>21</sup> In 1850, there were 1,608 free inhabitants residing in Alachua County; 53.5 percent listed birthplaces outside of Florida. Of the people that were born in states other than Florida, the

18. "Florida: Its Soil and Products," *The Western Journal* 6 (June 1851), 179; Jerrell H. Shofner and William W. Rogers, "Sea Island Cotton in Ante-Bellum Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 40 (January 1962), 373-80.

19. *Jacksonville News*, January 22, 1847.

20. Kellar, *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist*, II, 462-63.

21. The manuscript returns of the seventh and eighth censuses (1850 and 1860, respectively) contain information about individuals, families, farms, and slave holdings. These two censuses are divided into six schedules: I, free inhabitants; II, slaves; III, mortality statistics; IV, production of agriculture; V, productions of industry; and VI, social statistics. The following citations will indicate the census and schedule from which the information was garnered.

majority— 86.6 percent— were natives of Georgia and South Carolina, states that were experiencing problems with soil exhaustion and poor crop yields. Furthermore, the age distribution of the 1850 residents indicates that most of the settlers from outside Florida— 77.7 percent— were fifteen years of age and older. By contrast, three-quarters of the native-born Floridians— 75.1 percent— were under the age of fifteen, and over one-third— 38.7 percent— were less than five years old.<sup>22</sup> A majority of the people born in Florida, then, were children, and it was the older settlers— the non-natives— who would become Alachua County's economic and political leaders in the years just prior to the Civil War.

A majority of Alachua County's 1850 male residents— 74.8 percent— listed farming as their principal profession.<sup>23</sup> It was likely also that many people who reported another primary occupation were also engaged in some farm activities, if no more than producing food for themselves and their families. Yet if the prospects for finding fertile, virgin land had been the sole force that prompted agriculturists into this frontier county, one could expect a fairly even mixture of birthplaces listed. Farmers from Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina should have been equally attracted to north-central Florida if fresh soil had been the only impetus to migration. This, however, was not the case. An examination of occupations among those heads of families who had moved into Alachua County before 1850 indicates that 76.4 percent of Georgians and 85.1 percent of South Carolinians were farmers, while among the migrants from all other states, only 57.8 percent listed farming as their principal occupation. In fact, 73.7 percent of all family heads who were involved primarily in agriculture production were from Georgia and South Carolina— the two states that had suffered the greatest from soil depletion.<sup>24</sup> The evidence, then, is supportive of the idea that alone the advantages of the frontier was not enough to spur emigration from one region to another. Most agriculturists, it seems, only moved into north-central Florida when conditions in the older areas became unfavorable.

---

22. Manuscript returns of the Seventh U. S. Census, 1850, Alachua County, FL, schedule I (free population), National Archives Microfilm Series M-432, roll 58.

23. *Ibid.*

24. *Ibid.*

For the people who emigrated to Alachua County in the late 1840s land was available. By 1850, nearly one-half— 43.8 percent— of the families in the area owned at least one small farm. By 1860, the percentage of families who owned real estate increased markedly to 65.1 percent.<sup>25</sup> Of course, the land would have to be cleared or “improved” before it could be utilized for agriculture production. In this respect, Alachua County remained in 1850 only slightly better than a wilderness since only 16.7 percent of the total real estate owned was denoted as improved acreage.<sup>26</sup>

Clearing land in the mid-nineteenth century was a physically demanding task. The small-scale farmer usually could clear within a year or two enough acreage to sustain himself and his dependent family. But for the agriculturist who hoped to garner substantial profits from his property, it was imperative to the process of land clearing, planting, and harvesting that he either have grown sons, hired hands, or slaves. Of the 274 households listed in the 1850 Alachua County census returns, 40.5 percent— 111 households— were the owners of slaves. But a majority of these slaveowners— 75.7 percent— possessed fewer than ten bondsmen; just over 10 percent owned more than twenty slaves; and only three households possessed more than forty.<sup>27</sup>

The majority of Alachua County slaveholders in 1850 were migrants from other states and presumably had brought their slaves with them when they moved into the area. Of the 111 heads of household who owned slaves in 1850, 90 percent were born outside Florida.<sup>28</sup> This is not proof, of course, that slaves were not purchased once the emigrant reached Florida. However, given the premise that most migration into the area had been quite recent and that Alachua County was isolated from population centers where slaves could have been easily obtained,

---

25. Manuscript returns of the Seventh U. S. Census, 1850, Alachua County, schedule IV (productions of agriculture), on microfilm in P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL. Manuscript returns of the Eighth U. S. Census, 1860, Alachua County, schedule IV (productions of agriculture), on microfilm in P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History.

26. Seventh Census, schedule IV.

27. Manuscript returns of the Seventh U. S. Census, 1850, Alachua County, schedule II (slaves), National Archives Microfilm Series M-432, roll 60.

28. *Ibid.*

it would seem plausible that a majority of the slaves accompanied their masters onto the frontier. And since most of the newcomers were from Georgia and South Carolina, the majority of the slaveowners— percent— were from these two states.<sup>29</sup>

In the years from 1850 to 1860, the conditions that favored the production of market crops in Alachua County— particularly cotton— improved. A major factor in the enhancement of the county's attractiveness to planters was the proposal and eventual completion of the Florida Railroad. This line stretched across the peninsula from Fernandina to Cedar Key. The Florida Railroad, by 1860, passed through the heart of Alachua County and provided the population with convenient and reliable transportation of commodities in and out of the region.<sup>30</sup>

While the appeal of north-central Florida continued to grow during the final decade of the antebellum period, agricultural conditions in the plantation belt of the older parts of the South remained in a state of deterioration. An examination of the 1850 and 1860 census returns from several contiguous middle Georgia and central South Carolina counties indicates that most lost population or gained only a very small number of residents during that ten-year period.<sup>31</sup> Had there been no further migration into these counties, one could expect that natural increase from births would have contributed to some growth. It must be concluded, therefore, that counties which lost population and those with little or no population growth all witnessed an exodus from 1850 to 1860.

The increased push from the worn-out regions and the stronger pull of an evolving area combined to have an important effect on the growth and development of north-central Florida. From 1850 to 1860, the free population of Alachua County

---

29. *Ibid.*

30. Cox and Hildreth, *History of Gainesville*, 11-12.

31. Counties surveyed were taken from a four-county-wide area from the Macon vicinity northeast through central South Carolina. Of the twenty-five Georgia and eleven South Carolina counties sampled, only eight increased their population in the ten-year period. Population figures are from *The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850*, House Misc. Docs., vol. 2, 32d Cong., 2d sess., 464-65, 338-39; *Population in the United States in 1860; Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census*, House Misc. Docs., vol. 5, 38th Cong., 1st sess., 58-61, 449.

more than doubled, and the slave population quadrupled.<sup>32</sup> In a study of economic and social mobility within Alachua County, only 146 individuals could be linked from the 1850 to the 1860 census.<sup>33</sup> This fact suggests, then, that population expansion in this decade was due largely to migration. An examination of the origin of heads of family (or, interchangeably, heads of household) will illustrate that a majority of this population growth was due to emigration from other states— especially the two older states of Georgia and South Carolina. In 1850, 123 of the family heads in Alachua County were Georgia-born; by 1860 native Georgians accounted for 309 of the county's heads of household. The county also experienced an increase in the number of native South Carolinian families from sixty-seven in 1850 to 338 in 1860.<sup>34</sup>

Alachua County did experience during the 1850-1860 period a significant increase in the number of native Floridians who were heads of household— twenty-seven to 110. There was also an increase in heads of household from other states— forty-five to 151. But of the county's emigrants, it was the people from Georgia and South Carolina who were most likely engaged in farming as their principal means of livelihood. Indeed, 66.3 percent of Georgians and 55.9 percent of the South Carolinians were agriculturists. By contrast, only 36.4 percent of the migrant heads of household from all of the other states combined farmed for a living.<sup>35</sup> Also significant was the number of slaveholders that were native Georgians or South Carolinians. By 1860, nearly three-quarters-74.9 percent— of Alachua County's slaveholding population were from these two states.<sup>36</sup>

By 1860, Alachua County had become one of Florida's major cotton-producing counties. Free population in the county had slightly more than doubled, the amount of acreage listed as improved had quadrupled, and the total value of real estate had

---

32. The white population of Alachua County increased to 3,767 in 1860; the slave population, which was 906 in 1850, rose to 4,457 by 1860. *Seventh Census of the United States: 1850*, 400; *Population of the United States in 1860*, 51, 53.

33. Patricia Smith Garretson, "Social and Economic Mobility: Alachua County, 1850-1860" (unpublished manuscript), 11.

34. Seventh Census, schedule I; Eighth Census, schedule I.

35. *Ibid.*

36. Eighth Census, schedule II.

increased to more than seven times its 1850 value.<sup>37</sup> Only six other Florida counties produced more cotton than Alachua County, and since the census returns do not distinguish between Green-Seed Cotton and Sea-Island Cotton, it can be assumed that the county's cotton crop— a portion of which was more likely the finer Sea-Island variety— had a higher value and thus afforded Alachua County's farmers and planters a larger margin of profit.<sup>38</sup>

Given time, north-central Florida surely would have developed into a cotton-producing region that could rival many of the traditional cotton states. But it was more than just the region's ability to produce agricultural profits that encouraged migration into the area. The promise of fertile acreage— and the consequent prospects of wealth and prosperity— was surely one force that lured men from the familiar, settled lands of South Carolina and Georgia into the Florida wilderness. Yet without the constant push of worn-out land and dwindling profits, it would be hard to explain the rapid development that characterized the settlement of north-central Florida during the late antebellum era.

---

37. Garretson, "Social and Economic Mobility," 14.

38. Smith, *Slavery and Plantation Growth in Antebellum Florida*, 11. See also Shofner and Rogers, "Sea Island Cotton in Ante-Bellum Florida," 379-80 for discussion of the value of Sea-Island cotton in Florida.